



County of San Diego

MARK WARDLAW
DIRECTOR

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
5510 OVERLAND AVENUE, SUITE 310, SAN DIEGO, CA 92123
www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds

KATHLEEN A. FLANNERY
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR

November 3, 2017

Statement of Reasons for Exemption from Additional Environmental Review and 15183 Checklist Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15183

Project Title: Rancho Sueños Agricultural Clearing
Record ID: PDS2017-AD-17-009, LOG NO. PDS2017-ER-17-009
Plan Area: Ramona Community Plan Area
GP Designation: Semi-Rural 4 (SR-4)
Zoning: Limited Agriculture, A70
Special Area Reg.: C, D8
Lot Size: 4.33 Acres
Applicant: Frank Allen, 27455 Almendra, Mission Viejo, CA 92691. (949) 768-6850
Staff Contact: Frank Santana - (858) 495-5331
Frank.Santana@sdcounty.ca.gov

Project Description

The proposed project is for a 2.60-acre agricultural clearing permit on a 4.33 acre property. The project site is located at 7270 Rancho Sueños Drive in the Ramona Community Planning Area. The site is currently vacant and features native and non-native vegetation communities.

The agricultural clearing permit would also include an associated 12 foot wide decomposed granite driveway off Rancho Sueños Drive and a 60 foot by 35 foot decomposed granite parking area. Water would be provided by the Ramona Municipal Water District. No sewage or septic systems would be installed for the project. Earthwork would consist of 200 cubic yards of earth movement with no import or export of soils.

The project site is subject to the Semi-Rural General Plan Regional Category, Land Use Designation Semi-Rural Residential. Zoning for the site is Limited Agriculture (A70).

Overview

California Public Resources Code section 21083.3 and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15183 provide an exemption from additional environmental review for projects that are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was certified, except as might be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or its site. Section 15183 specifies that examination of

environmental effects shall be limited to those effects that: (1) Are peculiar to the project or the parcel on which the project would be located, and were not analyzed as significant effects in a prior EIR on the zoning action, general plan, or community plan, with which the project is consistent, (2) Are potentially significant off-site impacts and cumulative impacts which were not discussed in the prior EIR prepared for the general plan, community plan or zoning action, or (3) Are previously identified significant effects which, as a result of substantial new information which was not known at the time the EIR was certified, are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the prior EIR. Section 15183(c) further specifies that if an impact is not peculiar to the parcel or to the proposed project, has been addressed as a significant effect in the prior EIR, or can be substantially mitigated by the imposition of uniformly applied development policies or standards, then an additional EIR need not be prepared for that project solely on the basis of that impact.

General Plan Update Program EIR

The County of San Diego General Plan Update (GPU) establishes a blueprint for future land development in the unincorporated County that meets community desires and balances the environmental protection goals with the need for housing, agriculture, infrastructure, and economic vitality. The GPU applies to all of the unincorporated portions of San Diego County and directs population growth and plans for infrastructure needs, development, and resource protection. The GPU included adoption of new General Plan elements, which set the goals and policies that guide future development. It also included a corresponding land use map, a County Road Network map, updates to Community and Subregional Plans, an Implementation Plan, and other implementing policies and ordinances. The GPU focuses population growth in the western areas of the County where infrastructure and services are available in order to reduce the potential for growth in the eastern areas. The objectives of this population distribution strategy are to: 1) facilitate efficient, orderly growth by containing development within areas potentially served by the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA) or other existing infrastructure; 2) protect natural resources through the reduction of population capacity in sensitive areas; and 3) retain or enhance the character of communities within the unincorporated County. The SDCWA service area covers approximately the western one third of the unincorporated County. The SDWCA boundary generally represents where water and wastewater infrastructure currently exist. This area is more developed than the eastern areas of the unincorporated County, and would accommodate more growth under the GPU.

The GPU EIR was certified in conjunction with adoption of the GPU on August 3, 2011. The GPU EIR comprehensively evaluated environmental impacts that would result from Plan implementation, including information related to existing site conditions, analyses of the types and magnitude of project-level and cumulative environmental impacts, and feasible mitigation measures that could reduce or avoid environmental impacts.

Summary of Findings

The proposed Rancho Sueños Agricultural Clearing (PDS2017-AD-17-009) is consistent with the analysis performed for the GPU EIR. Further, the GPU EIR adequately anticipated and described the impacts of the proposed project, identified applicable mitigation measures necessary to reduce project specific impacts, and the project implements these mitigation measures (see [http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/PDS/gpupdatedocs/BOS_Aug2011/EIR/FEIR_7.00 -
_Mitigation_Measures_2011.pdf](http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/PDS/gpupdatedocs/BOS_Aug2011/EIR/FEIR_7.00_-_Mitigation_Measures_2011.pdf) for complete list of GPU Mitigation Measures.

A comprehensive environmental evaluation has been completed for the project as documented in the attached §15183 Exemption Checklist. This evaluation concludes that the project qualifies for an exemption from additional environmental review because it is consistent with the development density and use characteristics established by the County of San Diego General

Plan, as analyzed by the San Diego County General Plan Update Final Program EIR (GPU EIR, ER #02-ZA-001, SCH #2002111067), and all required findings can be made.

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines §15183, the project qualifies for an exemption because the following findings can be made:

1. The project is consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an EIR was certified.

The proposed project is an agricultural clearing permit for clearing of 2.6 acres on a 4.3 acre property, which is consistent with the SR-4 Land Use Designation established by the General Plan and the certified GPU EIR.

2. There are no project specific effects which are peculiar to the project or its site, and which the GPU EIR Failed to analyze as significant effects.

The subject property is no different than other properties in the surrounding area, and there are no project specific effects which are peculiar to the project or its site. The project site is located in an area developed with estate residential lots with associated accessory uses. The property does not support any peculiar environmental features, and the project would not result in any peculiar effects.

In addition, as explained further in the 15183 Checklist below, all project impacts were adequately analyzed by the GPU EIR. The project could result in potentially significant impacts to biological and cultural resources. However, applicable mitigation measures specified within the GPU EIR have been made conditions of approval for this project.

3. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which the GPU EIR failed to evaluate.

The proposed project is consistent with the density and use characteristics of the development considered by the GPU EIR and would represent a small part of the growth that was forecast for build-out of the General Plan. The GPU EIR considered the incremental impacts of the proposed project, and as explained further in the 15183 Exemption Checklist below, no potentially significant off-site or cumulative impacts have been identified which were not previously evaluated.

4. There is no substantial new information which results in more severe impacts than anticipated by the GPU EIR.

As explained in the 15183 exemption checklist below, no new information has been identified which would result in a determination of a more severe impact than what had been anticipated by the GPU EIR.

5. The project will undertake feasible mitigation measures specified in the GPU EIR.

As explained in the 15183 exemption checklist below, the project will undertake feasible mitigation measures specified in the GPU EIR. These GPU EIR mitigation measures will be undertaken through project design, compliance with regulations and ordinances, or through the project's conditions of approval.

Signature



Date

11/3/2017

Frank Santana

Printed Name

Project Manager

Title

CEQA Guidelines §15183 Exemption Checklist

Overview

This checklist provides an analysis of potential environmental impacts resulting from the proposed project. Following the format of CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, environmental effects are evaluated to determine if the project would result in a potentially significant impact triggering additional review under Guidelines section 15183.

- Items checked “Significant Project Impact” indicates that the project could result in a significant effect which either requires mitigation to be reduced to a less than significant level or which has a significant, unmitigated impact.
- Items checked “Impact not identified by GPU EIR” indicates the project would result in a project specific significant impact (peculiar off-site or cumulative that was not identified in the GPU EIR).
- Items checked “Substantial New Information” indicates that there is new information which leads to a determination that a project impact is more severe than what had been anticipated by the GPU EIR.

A project does not qualify for a §15183 exemption if it is determined that it would result in: 1) a peculiar impact that was not identified as a significant impact under the GPU EIR; 2) a more severe impact due to new information; or 3) a potentially significant off-site impact or cumulative impact not discussed in the GPU EIR.

A summary of staff’s analysis of each potential environmental effect is provided below the checklist for each subject area. A list of references, significance guidelines, and technical studies used to support the analysis is attached in Appendix A. Appendix B contains a list of GPU EIR mitigation measures.

Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
----------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------

1. AESTHETICS – Would the Project:

- | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

- 1(a) The property is visible from a public road; however, the site is not located within a viewshed of a scenic vista.
- 1(b) The property is not within the viewshed of a County or state scenic highway. The project site also does not support any significant scenic resources that would be lost or modified through development of the property.
- 1(c) The proposed agricultural clearing would be consistent with the existing community character. The project site is located in the Ramona Community Plan Area on Rancho Sueños Drive in an area characterized by rural residential and agricultural uses. The agricultural use and associated decomposed granite driveway and parking area would not substantially degrade the visual quality of the site or its surroundings.
- 1(d) The project does not propose any lighting or substantial sources of glare.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to aesthetics; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
----------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------

2. Agriculture/Forestry Resources

– Would the Project:

- | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, or other agricultural resources, to a non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

- c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production?
- d) Result in the loss of forest land, conversion of forest land to non-forest use, or involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of forest land to non-forest use?
- e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Important Farmland or other agricultural resources, to non-agricultural use?

Discussion

- 2(a) The project site and surrounding properties do not support any Farmland of Local Importance, Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.
- 2(b) The project site is not located within or adjacent to a Williamson Act contract or agriculturally zoned land.
- 2(c) There are no timberland production zones on or near the property.
- 2(d) The project site is not located near any forest lands.
- 2(e) The project proposes agricultural clearing, therefore it would not result in conversion of important farmland or other agricultural resources.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to agricultural resources; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
---	---	--

3. Air Quality – Would the Project:

- a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP)?
- b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?
- c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient

air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

- d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?
- e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

Discussion

- 3(a) The project proposes agricultural clearing that was anticipated and considered by SANDAG growth projections used in development of the RAQS and SIP. As such, the project would not conflict with either the RAQS or the SIP. In addition, the operational emissions from the project are below screening levels, and will not violate any ambient air quality standards.
- 3(b) Grading operations for the agricultural clearing and associated driveway and parking area would be subject to the Grading Ordinance, which requires the implementation of dust control measures. Emissions from the construction phase would be minimal, temporary and localized, resulting in pollutant emissions below the screening level criteria established by County air quality guidelines for determining significance. In addition, the vehicle trips generated from the project would result in ten Average Daily Trips (ADTs).
- 3(c) The project would contribute PM10, NOx, and VOCs emissions from construction/grading activities; however, the incremental increase would not exceed established screening thresholds (see question 3(b) above)).
- 3(d) The project would not introduce additional residential homes. Similarly, the project does not propose uses or activities that would result in exposure of these sensitive receptors to significant pollutant concentrations and will not place sensitive receptors near any carbon monoxide hotspots.
- 3(e) The project could produce objectionable odors during construction and operation; however, these substances, if present at all, would only be in trace amounts (less than 1 µg/m3).

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to air quality; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
---	---	--

4. Biological Resources – Would the Project:

- a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California

Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)?

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

e) Conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources?

Discussion

4(a) Biological resources on the project site were evaluated in a Biological Resources Report prepared by Schaefer Ecological Solutions, dated August 18, 2017. The project site features coastal sage scrub, chaparral and non-native grassland. The presence of coastal sage scrub creates the potential for the site to support the coastal California gnatcatcher (*Polioptila californica californica*). No other sensitive wildlife species were identified within the project site and have a low potential to occur because of the low quality and isolated nature of the biological resources. No sensitive plant species were identified onsite. The project site is located within the draft Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) North County Plan area. Ade minimus Habitat Loss Permit exemption for coastal sage scrub impacts was granted after gaining concurrence from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) in a letter to County staff dated October 25, 2017.

The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California.

4(b) Based on the Biological Resources Report, the 4.3 acre project site contains 0.42 acres of coastal sage scrub, 2.24 acres of chaparral, and 1.61 acres of non-native grassland. A total of 0.068 acres of coastal sage scrub, 1.35 acres of chaparral and 1.18 acres of non-native grassland would be impacted by the proposed project. As considered by the GPU EIR, project impacts would be mitigated through ordinance compliance and through implementation of GPU EIR mitigation measures Bio 1.6 and Bio 1.7. Specifically, the

project would establish or purchase offsite mitigation for 0.14 acres of coastal sage scrub and 1.26 acres of chaparral for habitat impacts.

- 4(c) Based on the Biological Resources Report federally protected wetlands or other jurisdictional waters do not occur onsite or within the 100 foot buffer area surrounding the project site. The proposed project site does not contain any wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, therefore, no impacts would occur.
- 4(d) Based on a GIS analysis, the County’s Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, site photos, and a Biological Resources Report, it was determined that the site is not part of a regional linkage/corridor nor is it in an area considered regionally important for wildlife dispersal. The site would not assist in local wildlife movement as it lacks connecting vegetation and is surrounded by properties developed with single family houses and agricultural habitat. The proposed project site is not connected to any native habitats, drainages, creeks, or streams which would facilitate wildlife movement.
- 4(e) The project is located in the draft Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) North County Plan area and is not subject to provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan or other approved local habitat conservation plan. The project adheres to all applicable local policies and ordinances that protect biological resources as verified by the County’s ordinance compliance checklist process.

Conclusion

The project could result in potentially significant impacts to biological resources; however, further environmental analysis is not required because:

- 1. No peculiar impacts to the project or its site have been identified.
- 2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
- 3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
- 4. Feasible mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR will be applied to the project.

Significa nt Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantia l New Informatio n
--	---	--

5. Cultural Resources – Would the Project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

- c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique geologic feature?
- d) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site?
- e) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

5(a) Based on an analysis of records and prior archaeological survey reports, it has been determined that there are no impacts to historical resources because they do not occur within the project site.

5(b) Based on an analysis of records, prior archaeological survey reports, and a field visit by County archaeologist Kassandra Nearn, no known archaeological resources have been identified within the project site.

Native American consultation included a Sacred Lands check which was initiated with the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on March 30, 2017. The Sacred Lands check conducted by the NAHC produced negative results. Tribal outreach was conducted with the following tribes: Barona, Campo, Santa Ysabel, Jamul, Kwaaymii, Sycuan, and Viejas. Campo, Viejas, and Santa Ysabel responded. Concerns raised by these tribes include:

1. Request for a copy of any previously completed cultural studies.
2. Notification of public review, hearings, and decision.
3. Archaeological monitoring to include a Kumeyaay Native American monitor.
4. Field visit by County Staff to verify prior completed archaeological survey reports.

Per the request of Santa Ysabel, County Staff conducted a field visit to verify the conditions described in prior survey reports. No further concerns were raised during consultation. These tribes have also been included in the distribution list for notification.

Although no resources were identified, there is the potential for the presence of subsurface deposits. As considered by the GPU EIR, potential impacts to unanticipated cultural resources will be mitigated through compliance with the Grading Ordinance and through conformance with the County's Cultural Resource Guidelines if resources are encountered. The project will be conditioned with archaeological monitoring (Cul-2.5) that includes the following requirements:

- Pre-Construction

- Pre-construction meeting to be attended by the Project Archaeologist and Kumeyaay Native American monitor to explain the monitoring requirements.
- Construction
 - Monitoring. Both the Project Archaeologist and Kumeyaay Native American monitor are to be onsite during earth disturbing activities. The frequency and location of monitoring of native soils will be determined by the Project Archaeologist in consultation with the Kumeyaay Native American monitor. Both the Project Archaeologist and Kumeyaay Native American monitor will evaluate fill soils to ensure that they are negative for cultural resources
 - If cultural resources are identified:
 - Both the Project Archaeologist and Kumeyaay Native American monitor have the authority to divert or temporarily halt ground disturbance operations in the area of the discovery.
 - The Project Archaeologist shall contact the County Archaeologist.
 - The Project Archaeologist in consultation with the County Archaeologist and Kumeyaay Native American shall determine the significance of discovered resources.
 - Construction activities will be allowed to resume after the County Archaeologist has concurred with the significance evaluation.
 - Isolates and non-significant deposits shall be minimally documented in the field. Should the isolates and non-significant deposits not be collected by the Project Archaeologist, the Kumeyaay Native American monitor may collect the cultural material for transfer to a Tribal curation facility or repatriation program.
 - If cultural resources are determined to be significant, a Research Design and Data Recovery Program shall be prepared by the Project Archaeologist in consultation with the Kumeyaay Native American monitor and approved by the County Archaeologist. The program shall include reasonable efforts to preserve (avoid) unique cultural resources of Sacred Sites; the capping of identified Sacred Sites or unique cultural resources and placement of development over the cap if avoidance is infeasible; and data recovery for non-unique cultural resources. The preferred option is preservation (avoidance).
 - Human Remains.
 - The Property Owner or their representative shall contact the County Coroner and the PDS Staff Archaeologist.
 - Upon identification of human remains, no further disturbance shall occur in the area of the find until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin.
 - If the remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the Most Likely Descendant (MLD), as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), shall be contacted by the Property Owner or their representative in order to determine proper treatment and disposition of the remains.

- The immediate vicinity where the Native American human remains are located is not to be damaged or disturbed by further development activity until consultation with the MLD regarding their recommendations as required by Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 has been conducted.
 - Public Resources Code §5097.98, CEQA §15064.5 and Health & Safety Code §7050.5 shall be followed in the event that human remains are discovered.
- Rough Grading
 - Upon completion of Rough Grading, a monitoring report shall be prepared identifying whether resources were encountered. A copy of the monitoring report shall be provided to the San Luis Rey Band of Mission Indians and any culturally-affiliated tribe who requests a copy.
 - Final Grading
 - A final report shall be prepared substantiating that earth-disturbing activities are completed and whether cultural resources were encountered. A copy of the final report shall be submitted to the South Coastal Information Center and any culturally-affiliated tribe who requests a copy.
 - Disposition of Cultural Material.
 - The final report shall include evidence that all prehistoric materials have been curated at a San Diego curation facility or Tribal curation facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79, or alternatively have been repatriated to a culturally affiliated tribe.
 - The final report shall include evidence that all historic materials have been curated at a San Diego curation facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79.
- 5(c) The site does not contain any unique geologic features that have been listed in the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance for Unique Geology Resources nor does the site support any known geologic characteristics that have the potential to support unique geologic features.
- 5(d) A review of the County's Paleontological Resources Maps and data on San Diego County's geologic formations indicates that the project is located on cretaceous plutonic geological formations that have no potential for containing paleontological resources.
- 5(e) Based on an analysis of records and prior archaeological surveys of the property, it has been determined that the project site does not include a formal cemetery or any known archaeological resources that might contain interred human remains.

Conclusion

The project could result in potentially significant impacts to cultural resources; however, further environmental analysis is not required because:

1. No peculiar impacts to the project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. Feasible mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR will be applied to the project.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
6. Geology and Soils – Would the Project:			
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, liquefaction, and/or landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in an on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- 6(a)(i) The project site is not located in a fault rupture hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California, or located within any other area with substantial evidence of a known fault.
- 6(a)(ii) The project proposes agricultural clearing and an associated driveway and parking area. The project does not propose any buildings or structures.

- 6(a)(iii) The project site is not within a “Potential Liquefaction Area” as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. In addition, the site is not underlain by poor artificial fill or located within a floodplain.
- 6(a)(iv) The site is not located within a “Landslide Susceptibility Area” as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards.
- 6(b) According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as Fallbrook-Vista Sandy Loams, 15 to 30 percent slopes, FvE, Fallbrook Sandy Loam, 5 to 15 percent slopes, eroded (FaC2 and FaD2), with a soil erodibility rating of moderate and severe. However, the project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil because the project will be required to comply with the Watershed Protection Ordinance (WPO) and Grading Ordinance which will ensure that the project would not result in any unprotected erodible soils, will not alter existing drainage patterns, and will not develop steep slopes. Additionally, the project will be required to implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) to prevent fugitive sediment.
- 6(c) The project is not located on or near geological formations that are unstable or would potentially become unstable as a result of the project.
- 6(d) The project is underlain by FvE, FaC2 and FaD2, which are considered to be expansive soils as defined within Table 18-I-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). However, the project does not propose any buildings or other structures.
- 6(e) The project would rely on public water. No septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems are proposed.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to/from geology/soils; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
--	----------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------

7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions – Would the Project:

- | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

- 7(a) The project proposes agricultural clearing of 2.60 acres and associated grading for a decomposed granite driveway and parking area. The project would produce Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions through construction activities, vehicle trips, and agricultural activities. A motorized backhoe will be used for a single day to clear and grade the site.

The project falls below the screening criteria that were developed to identify project types and sizes that would have less than cumulatively considerable GHG emissions.

7(b) As described above, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to global climate change. The project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing emissions of GHG emissions.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to GHG emissions; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
8. Hazards and Hazardous Materials – Would the Project:			
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, or is otherwise known to have been subject to a release of hazardous substances and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

g) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

h) Propose a use, or place residents adjacent to an existing or reasonably foreseeable use that would substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies, which are capable of transmitting significant public health diseases or nuisances?

Discussion

8(a) The proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it does not propose the storage, use, transport, emission, or disposal of Hazardous Substances, nor are Hazardous Substances proposed or currently in use in the immediate vicinity. In addition, the project does not propose to demolish any existing structures onsite which could produce a hazard related to the release of asbestos, lead based paint or other hazardous materials.

8(b) The project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

8(c) Based on a site visit and a comprehensive review of regulatory databases (see attached Hazards/Hazardous Materials references), the project site has not been subject to a release of hazardous substances. Additionally, the project does not propose structures for human occupancy or significant linear excavation within 1,000 feet of an open, abandoned, or closed landfill, is not located on or within 250 feet of the boundary of a parcel identified as containing burn ash (from the historic burning of trash), and is not on or within 1,000 feet of a Formerly Used Defense Site.

8(d) Although the proposed project is within one mile of the Ramona Municipal Airport, the project does not propose construction of any structures.

8(e) The proposed project is not within one mile of a private airstrip. In addition, the project does not propose construction of any structures

8(f)(i) OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN AND MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN: The project will not interfere with this plan because it will not prohibit subsequent plans from being established or prevent the goals and objectives of existing plans from being carried out.

8(f)(ii) SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN: The property is not within the San Onofre emergency planning zone.

8(f)(iii) OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT: The project is not located along the coastal zone.

8(f)(iv) EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN: The project would not alter major water or energy supply infrastructure which could interfere with the plan.

8f)(v) DAM EVACUATION PLAN: The project is not located within a dam inundation zone.

- 6(g) The proposed project is adjacent to wildlands that have the potential to support wildland fires. However, the project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires because the project will comply with the regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the Consolidated Fire Code. The project will not result in the construction of any structures and fire access is not required.
- 6(h) The project does not involve or support uses that would allow water to stand for a period of 72 hours or more (e.g. artificial lakes, agricultural ponds). Also, the project does not involve or support uses that will produce or collect animal waste, such as equestrian facilities, agricultural operations (chicken coops, dairies etc.), solid waste facility or other similar uses. Moreover, based on a site visit conducted by County staff, there are none of these uses on adjacent properties.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to/from hazards/hazardous materials; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
9. Hydrology and Water Quality – Would the Project:			
a) Violate any waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, could the project result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Could the proposed project cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

- g) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?
- h) Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?
- i) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, including County Floodplain Maps?
- j) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?
- k) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding?
- l) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?
- m) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

Discussion

- 9(a) The project will require a NPDES General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activities. The project applicant has provided a Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP) which demonstrates that the project will comply with all requirements of the WPO. The project will be required to implement site design measures, source control BMPs, and/or treatment control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants to the maximum extent practicable. These measures will enable the project to meet waste discharge requirements as required by the San Diego Municipal Permit, as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP).
- 9(b) The project lies in the Ramona (905.41) hydrologic subareas, within the San Dieguito hydrologic unit. According to the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list, a portion of this watershed is impaired for pollutants/stressors. Constituents of concern in the San Dieguito watershed include coliform bacteria, nutrients, sediment, lowered dissolve oxygen, and trace metals. The project could contribute to release of these pollutants; however, the project will comply with the WPO and implement site design measures, source control BMPs, and treatment control BMPs to prevent a significant increase of pollutants to receiving waters.
- 9(c) As stated in responses 9(a) and 9(b) above, implementation of BMPs and compliance with required ordinances will ensure that project impacts are less than significant.
- 9(d) The project will obtain its water supply from the Ramona Water District that obtains water from surface reservoirs or other imported sources. The project will not use any

groundwater. In addition, the project does not involve operations that would interfere substantially with groundwater recharge.

- 9(e) As outlined in the project's SWMP, the project will implement source control and/or treatment control BMP's to reduce potential pollutants, including sediment from erosion or siltation, to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff.
- 9(f) The project will not significantly alter established drainage patterns or significantly increase the amount of runoff for the following reasons: impervious surfaces will not be created as a result of the project and grading will be limited to 200 cubic yards on the site.
- 9(g) The project does not propose to create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems.
- 9(h) The project has the potential to generate pollutants; however, site design measures, source control BMPs, and treatment control BMPs will be employed such that potential pollutants will be reduced to the maximum extent practicable.
- 9(i) No FEMA mapped floodplains, County-mapped floodplains or drainages with a watershed greater than 25 acres were identified on the project site or off-site improvement locations.
- 9(j) No 100-year flood hazard areas were identified on the project site or offsite improvement locations.
- 9(k) The project site lies outside any identified special flood hazard area.
- 9(l) The project site lies outside a mapped dam inundation area for a major dam/reservoir within San Diego County. In addition, the project is not located immediately downstream of a minor dam that could potentially flood the property.
- 9(m)(i) SEICHE: The project site is not located along the shoreline of a lake or reservoir.
- 9(m)(ii) TSUNAMI: The project site is not located in a tsunami hazard zone.
- 9(m)(iii) MUDFLOW: Mudflow is type of landslide. See response to question 6(a)(iv).

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to/from hydrology/water quality; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
10. Land Use and Planning – Would the Project:			
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan,	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Discussion

10(a) The project does not propose the introduction of new infrastructure such as major roadways, water supply systems, or utilities to the area.

10(b) The project proposes agricultural clearing within an area with a General Plan land use designation of Semi-Rural 4 (SR-4). The project would not conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, including policies of the General Plan and Community Plan.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to land use/planning; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
11. Mineral Resources – Would the Project:			
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11(a) The project site has been classified by the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology as No Alluvium/No Mines (MRZ-3). However, the project site is surrounded by residential uses which are incompatible to future extraction of mineral resources on the project site. A future mining operation at the project site would likely create a significant impact to neighboring properties for issues such as noise, air quality, traffic, and possibly other impacts. Therefore, the project will not result in the loss of a known mineral resource because the resource has already been lost due to incompatible land uses.			
11(b) The project site is not located in an Extractive Use Zone (S-82), nor does it have an Impact Sensitive Land Use Designation (24) with an Extractive Land Use Overlay (25).			

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to mineral resources; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
12. Noise – Would the Project:			

- | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

12(a) The area surrounding the project site consists of residential and agricultural land uses. The project proposes clearing for agricultural use. The project would not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the General Plan, Noise Ordinance, or other applicable standards for the following reasons:

General Plan – The Noise Element addresses noise sensitive areas and requires projects to comply with a Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) of 60 decibels (dBA) for existing and proposed noise sensitive land uses. Projects which could produce noise in excess of 60 dB(A) are required to incorporate design measures or mitigation as necessary to comply with the Noise Element. Based on a review of the County’s noise contour maps, the project is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to noise in excess of 60 dB(A). The project is an Administrative Permit for clearing of 2.60 acres on a 4.3 acre property. Noise activities associated are temporary related to the removal of vegetation and would not result in any exceed to the County Noise Element.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36-404: Non-transportation noise generated by the project is not expected to exceed the standards of the Noise Ordinance at or beyond the project’s property line related to on-going operational noise generating activities. The project after clearing would result in an agricultural use that would be subject to comply with the County Noise Ordinance. Associated agricultural operations would not involve any noise producing equipment that would exceed applicable noise levels at the adjoining property line. Additionally, the applicant is required to comply with the County Noise Ordinance.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36-409: The project is an Administrative Permit to allow clearing for agricultural use. The temporary activities associated with clearing will not generate construction equipment noise in excess of Noise Ordinance standards. Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation. Also, it is not anticipated that the project will operate construction equipment in excess of an average sound level of 75dB between the hours of 7 AM and 7 PM.

- 12(b) The project proposes agricultural uses with no inhabited structures. It is not anticipated that the proposed project would expose persons to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels
- 12(c) As indicated in the response listed under Section 12(a), the project would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas in the vicinity to a substantial permanent increase in noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of any applicable noise standards. Also, the project is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to direct noise impacts over existing ambient noise levels.
- 12(d) The temporary activities associated with clearing will not generate construction equipment noise in excess of Noise Ordinance standards. Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation. Also, it is not anticipated that the project will operate construction equipment in excess of an average sound level of 75dB between the hours of 7 AM and 7 PM.
- 12(e) The proposed project is located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for airports for the Ramona Airport. However, the project implementation is not expected to expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels in excess of the CNEL 60 dB(A) because the project is associated with agricultural clearing activities. This is based on staff’s review of projected County noise contour maps (CNEL 60 dB(A) contours) and review by County Noise Specialist Emmet Aquino on October 6, 2017. The location of the project is outside of the CNEL 60 dB(A) contours for the Ramona airport as shown on the ALUCP.
- 12(f) The proposed project is not located within a one-mile vicinity of a private airstrip; therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to/from noise; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
---	---	--

13. Population and Housing – Would the Project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

- b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
- c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

Discussion

- 13(a) The project would not induce substantial population growth in an area because the project does not propose any physical or regulatory change that would remove a restriction to or encourage population growth in an area.
- 13(b) The project site is undeveloped. The proposed project would not displace existing housing.
- 13(c) The proposed project would not displace a substantial number of people since the site is currently vacant.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to populations/housing; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
---	---	--

14. Public Services – Would the Project:

- a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios for fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities?

Discussion

- 14(a) Based on the project’s service availability forms, the project would not result in the need for significantly altered services or facilities.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to public services; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
---	---	--

15. Recreation – Would the Project:

- | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

- 15(a) The project proposes clearing for agricultural clearing. The project would not result in the construction of residences and therefore would not increase the use of existing parks or other recreational facilities.
- 15(b) The project does not include any recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of any recreational facilities.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to recreation; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
16. Transportation and Traffic – Would the Project:			
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of the effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

- 16(a) The project would result in an additional ten ADTs. However, the project would not conflict with any established performance measures because the project trips do not exceed the thresholds established by County guidelines. In addition, the project would not conflict with policies related to non-motorized travel such as mass transit, pedestrian or bicycle facilities.
- 16(b) The additional ten ADTs from the project do not exceed the 2400 trips (or 200 peak hour trips) required for study under the region's Congestion Management Program as developed by SANDAG.
- 16(c) The proposed project will not result in the construction of any structures and will not impact air traffic patterns or levels.
- 16(d) The proposed project would not alter traffic patterns, roadway design, place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways, or create curves, slopes or walls which would impede adequate sight distance on a road.
- 16(e) The San Diego County Fire Authority has reviewed the project and determined that since there are no structures associated with the project there is adequate emergency fire access.
- 16(f) The project would not result in the construction of any road improvements or new road design features that would interfere with the provision of public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities. In addition, the project does not generate sufficient travel demand to increase demand for transit, pedestrian or bicycle facilities.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to transportation/traffic; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
---	---	--

17. Utilities and Service Systems – Would the Project:

- | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Discussion

17(a) The project does not propose any sewer or septic system. No wastewater treatment will be required as no residences or associated structures would be constructed as part of the project and thus no discharge will be created.

17(b) The project involves new water pipeline extensions. However, these extensions will not result in additional adverse physical effects beyond those already identified in other sections of this environmental analysis.

17(c) The project does not involves new storm water drainage facilities.

17(d) A Service Availability Letter from the Ramona Municipal Water District has been provided which indicates that there is adequate water to serve the project.

17(e) The project would not utilize sewer and there will be no installation of a septic system.

17(f) All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. There are five, permitted active landfills in San Diego County with remaining capacity to adequately serve the project.

17(g) The project will deposit all solid waste at a permitted solid waste facility.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to utilities and service systems; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

Attachments:

Appendix A – References

Appendix B – Summary of Determinations and Mitigation within the Final Environmental Impact Report, County of San Diego General Plan Update, SCH # 2002111067

Appendix A

The following is a list of project specific technical studies used to support the analysis of each potential environmental effect:

Schaefer Ecological Solutions, Christina Schaefer (August 18, 2017). Biological Letter Report in of the Rancho Sueños Vineyard Project, Ramona, San Diego County, CA.

For a complete list of technical studies, references, and significance guidelines used to support the analysis of the General Plan Update Final Certified Program EIR, dated August 3, 2011, please visit the County's website at:

<http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/pds/gpupdate/environmental.html>

Appendix B

A Summary of Determinations and Mitigation within the Final Environmental Impact Report, County of San Diego General Plan Update, SCH # 2002111067 is available on the Planning and Development Services website at:

http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds/gpupdate/GPU_FEIR_Summary_15183_Reference.pdf